

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
13.1 Introduction	
13.1	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objection to the intention to have a collaborative joint masterplanning approach which is then taken through to a formal SPD – will add unnecessary financial burdens and delay. Suggest new wording to this effect <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of consultation with stakeholders such as The Welwyn Garden City Society, Friends of Panshanger Park and Hertfordshire Gardens Trust 2. Local community were not consulted 3. An amendment to the Policy Map is suggested due to an incorrectly defined Local Wildlife Site
13.2 Development East of Welwyn Garden City	
13.2	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of Green Belt – no evidence of exceptional circumstances
13.2.9	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact on congestion on A414 and local roads
13.2.10	<p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concern over capacity of healthcare services – only a minor injuries unit at the former QEII hospital
13.2.13	<p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inconsistency between East Herts and Welwyn Hatfield Plans in text

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
Policy EWGC1 Land East of Welwyn Garden City	
EWGC1	<p data-bbox="416 352 551 387"><u>Support</u></p> <ol data-bbox="416 392 1339 517" style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support intended sustainable transport measures 2. Support for intended sustainable drainage measures 3. Support for intended recreation uses <p data-bbox="416 564 573 600"><u>Objection</u></p> <ol data-bbox="416 604 2045 1378" style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Heritage Impact Assessment has not considered all necessary areas and no specific mitigation is committed in the policy to address the HIA 2. Policy should require a three form entry primary school 3. Reference to an all through school should be removed as it has not been decided how the education facility should come forward 4. Preference cited for two adjacent rather than all-through schools 5. The need for eight forms of entry at secondary level is questioned as the proposal would require five forms. S106 requirements should be proportionate to the development. They also question the amount of land required for the secondary school (8-10 ha for secondary school of 5-6fe and 2.5ha for 3fe primary). More land than this would impact on viability. 6. Objection to development immediately west of the A414 – impact on heritage assets, contrary to Policy HA8 Historic Parks and Gardens, impact on Hatfield House and estate and Panshanger Park, needs a full archaeological appraisal 7. Visual impact and impact on landscape grounds, including on views of river corridors 8. Impact on green infrastructure, environmental assets, wildlife including badgers, river corridor, open rural landscape, needs a full ecological appraisal, soil erosion impacting on river Mimram, need for network of reed bed marshes, existing woodlands becoming sterile 9. Lack of green infrastructure / contradiction to Welwyn Hatfield Green Corridor plans

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>10. Will cause flooding downstream and risks of water pollution</p> <p>11. Concern regarding water abstraction and resultant river health</p> <p>12. Lack of integration to the existing town</p> <p>13. Presence of contaminated land – prejudicing development and open space use, harmful to human health, leaching of contaminants to adjacent non-filled land, unrecorded tipping beyond known landfill site</p> <p>14. Noise and air pollution caused by the development</p> <p>15. Use of Gascoyne Cecil Estate land as a buffer zone between the site and Panshanger Park</p> <p>16. Much reduced area of land proposed as an alternative for consideration.</p> <p>17. Green Belt loss – no exceptional circumstances evidenced</p> <p>18. Does not meet the needs arising from Hertford</p> <p>19. Will cause coalescence between Hertford and Welwyn Garden City</p> <p>20. Lack of evidence for Gypsy and Traveller needs – proximity of existing site</p> <p>21. Conflict with proximity of homes to household waste site</p> <p>22. Uncertainty over deliverability of required mitigation measures and responsibility for future maintenance</p> <p>23. Fails Duty to Co-operate as no engagement with Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council</p> <p>24. Fails Duty to Co-operate with Hertingfordbury Neighbourhood Plan Group</p> <p>25. No consultation on mineral extraction</p> <p>26. Impact of new homes adjacent to mineral extraction plant</p> <p>27. Cannot meet Garden City principles</p> <p>28. Impact on existing town’s infrastructure</p> <p>29. Impact on neighbouring residential areas</p> <p>30. Impact on road network and ability to access the site</p> <p>31. Too far from town centre and station</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>32. Over-reliance on assumption that people will use non-car modes of transport 33. Rural bus network is poor 34. Land south of B195 is not available for development 35. Does not meet needs of the LSCC corridor 36. Amendment to Policy is suggested to reflect their proposed masterplan and concept statement</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A detailed drainage strategy will be required to assess the wastewater capacity in this area. 2. Inconsistency between the policies in the East Herts and Welwyn Hatfield Plans – open spaces 3. New wording requested with regards to green infrastructure (consistent with WHBC local plan) 4. Clear map should be provide for proposed footpaths and links 5. Policy requires amendment to appropriately deal with known mineral reserves 6. Policy requires amendment to appropriately deal with safeguarded waste recycling facilities 7. Need to ensure adequate provision of open spaces and leisure facilities
Figure 13.2 Strategy Diagram	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for designation of Eco-Aggregates site as employment land <p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Figure 13.2 Strategy Diagram should be replaced with the equivalent from the WHBC Plan <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Error in location of waste management facility symbol 2. Omits new traveller site

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
Policy Map	<u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. Scale should be the same for WHBC Local Plan and East Herts District Plan